REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action dated December 8, 2008. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify and/or to more clearly recite the "file control" and other features of the invention and to overcome the claims objections and rejections. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Support to all features may be found in the specification. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. The Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 6 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,948 Aoki, (hereinafter *Aoki*). *Aoki*, however, does not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable because *Aoki* does not suggest the subject matter recited by Applicants' Claims, as amended. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regards to exemplary Claim 1 (and similar Claims 8 and 15), *Aoki* does not disclose or render obvious at least the following features:

> the file control applying a first distinct visual feature to each of the first one or more files, wherein the first distinct visual feature is associated with the first operation;
>
> the file control applying a second distinct visual feature to each of the second one or more files, wherein the second distinct visual feature is associated with the second operation and is different from the first distinct visual feature; and
>
> the file control in response to receiving a single command to execute the first and second operations, executing the first and second operations on the first and second one or more files, respectively.

The Examiner has referenced Figures 6a-6e of *Aoki* as teaching the two "applying" elements and the related features recited by Claim 1. Having reviewed the Figures cited and associated sections of *Aoki* and *Aoki* as a whole, the Applicants believe that the Examiner is mischaracterizing and/or misapplying the reference. *Aoki* generally provides a method for

associating successive operations through the display of successive and/or juxtaposed icons. For example, column 9, lines 47-64 of *Aoki* recites:

> In the figure, a plural number (e.g., three) of function icons are horizontally arrayed while being in contact with one another. A program is composed by combining those three icons. An icon of a data file is dragged to and dropped in the leftmost icon of the function icon series (FIG. 6(A)). The function of the leftmost icon is executed for the data file, the output of the leftmost icon is transferred to the function of the second icon counted from the left (FIGS. 6(B) to 6(C)). The function of the second icon is executed for the output and the output of the second icon is transferred to the function of the final icon of those function icons (FIGS. 6(C) to 6(D)). When the function of the final icon is executed for the output of the second icon, final data is obtained (FIG. 6(D)). When the final data is obtained, a box representative of the result is displayed (FIG. 6.E)). By clicking the result box, final data is displayed.

Upon reading the cited passages of *Aoki*, it is clear to one skilled in the art, that *Aoki*, is solely concerned with performing multiple successive operations to a single file in response to dragging an icon corresponding to a data file to a first function icon of a series function icons, each icon in the series having varying visual representations. The multiple operations are then successively performed to the selected file, in order of the function series, until an output result is achieved.

In contrast to *Aoki*, the Applicants' claimed invention recites applying distinct visual features corresponding to a first and second operation to a first and second one or more files, respectively. The first and second operations may then be executed on the first and the second one or more files by issuing a single command. For example, in the Applicants' claimed invention, a first operation (e.g., copy) is assigned to a first one or more files, and a second operation (e.g., delete) is assigned to a second one or more files. The file control applies a first distinct visual feature to the first one or more files (e.g, color-coding the first one or more files green to indicate copy), and a second distinct visual feature is applied to the second one or more files (e.g., color-coding the second one or more files red to indicate delete). Upon receiving an execution command, the file control performs the first operation (copy) to each of the first one or more files, and the second operation (delete) to the second one or more files. The Applicants' invention as claimed, provides unique functionality not disclosed or suggested by *Aoki*, in allowing the queuing of different operations on different selections of files. A user can then

simultaneously view all pending operations by reviewing the different color-coding of the files (each different color corresponding to a different operation). As claimed, the distinct visual features are applied to the actual files themselves instead of to a grouping of adjacent functional icons corresponding to operations, as disclosed by *Aoki*.

With regards to the "executing" element of Applicants' Claim 1, *Aoki* does not disclose or render obvious, "in response to receiving a single command" executing a first operation on a first one or more files and a second operation on a second one or more files. *Aoki*, rather, merely provides a method for queuing multiple successive operations on a same file based on a file being dragged-and-dropped into an icon in contact with the currently executed icon (see also, col. 9, lines 38-43). The Applicants' invention, in contrast recites: "the file control, in response to receiving a single command to execute the first and second operations, executing the first operation on the first one or more files and the second operation on the second one or more files". In this manner, in response to a single execution command, the different operations on different file groupings (one or more files) are performed.

Because neither the cited portions of *Aoki*, nor *Aoki* as a whole, discloses or renders obvious the "applying" or "executing" elements, as expressly claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under U.S.C. § 103(a) of exemplary Claim 1, similar Claims 8 and 15, and their respective dependent claims should be withdrawn.

B. The Rejection of Claims 13, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 12 of the present Office Action, Claims 13, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Aoki* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0114265 to Talbert (hereinafter *Talbert*). The combination of *Aoki* and *Talbert* does not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable because that combination does not suggest, to one skilled in the art at the time of Applicants' invention, several of the features recited by Applicants' claims, as amended. Further, these claims respectively depend on base Claims 1, 8, and 15, which Applicants have shown above to be allowable over the primary reference. Based

on the dependency of Claims 13, 14, and 19 on allowable base Claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, the present rejections are also overcome by the foregoing remarks.

From the above discussion/arguments and the reasons provided therein, it is clear that the various combinations of references do not suggest features of Applicants' claimed invention. One skilled in the art would not find Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable over the combination of references. The above claims are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to more clearly and completely recite features within the claims. Applicants have also explained why Applicants' claims are not obvious in light of the combinations of references provided. The arguments overcome the claim rejections, and Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at (512) 617-5525 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eustace P. Isidore/
Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Ste. 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.611

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)